	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/697,110	ISHII, MAKOTO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Taghi T. Arani	2131
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Taghi T. Arani</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Dennis M. Smid, ESq</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 March 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.	•	•
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
4, 12-13, 16, and 24		
Prior art documents discussed:	•	•
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
	•	
		·
Tagla T. arces		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Lack of anticident basis in the claims 13, 16 and 24 reciting the term "examination means" raised and agrred to ament the claims for "receiver terminal". Applicant suggested minor corrections in claims 4, 12, and 24 to replace the term "have" with "having".